REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Hegde in view of Schaffer et al. This contention is respectfully traversed.

As previously explained, claim 18 defines not only bandwidth allocation but also access priority, which can be low or high. Unlike the teaching in Hegde, the method of claim 18 provides access to the high priority access values and only after each of those high priority access values get access, providing access to the lower priority access values.

The rejection correctly points out that Hegde teaches assigning priorities to the different processes. Each of the processes can have a value between the highest and the lowest priority. The rejection refers to many of the different summary locations within Hegde which summarizes the way in which bandwidth can be allocated. However, Hegde's specific discussion of how the operation is done is provided in column 6. A CPU use table keeps track of which process has gotten specific amounts of bandwidth and which process needs more bandwidth. Each process is adjusted to make sure it gets the amount of bandwidth that it has been allocated. However, there is no

PAGE 9/12 * RCVD AT 1/20/2005 9:15:01 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:8586785099 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-46

teaching or suggestion that high priority processes will be serviced before low priority processes. Hedge maintains the table so that CPU percentage matches the desired percentage. See for example column 7 and 8. Each time that there is a service timer interrupt, the bandwidth manager decides where the next CPU time should be used, see generally column 7 line 54th through 57.

Each time there is an interrupt, the processes are adjusted to get their share of CPU bandwidth. None of the processes are adjusted with a higher priority than others, although some get more bandwidth than others. The point is that nothing in Hegde teaches or suggests a way that some process, such as process Pa, could be serviced before the other processes. Therefore, the subject matter of claim 18 completely different than Hegde. Claim 18 defines a priority value where the high priority requests all get granted (within an access cycle) prior to the low priority requests. Hegde does not teach or suggest the subject matter.

The secondary reference to Schaffer et al similarly does not teach this subject matter. Schaffer teaches shared resource access based on priority levels. It does not teach or suggest the subject matter noted above.

PAGE 10/12 * RCVD AT 1/20/2005 9:15:01 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:8586785099 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-46

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

PAGE 11/12 * RCVD AT 1/20/2005 9:15:01 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:8586785099 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-46

Application Serial No.: 09/771,374
Attorney's Docket No.:10559-177001

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2005

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10476650.doc

PAGE 12/12 * RCVD AT 1/20/2005 9:15:01 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:8586785099 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-46